

# The New REPUBLIC

*A Journal of Opinion*

VOLUME XX

New York, Wednesday, August 20, 1919

Number 250

## Contents

The Week .....	67
Leading Editorials .....	
Direct Action and the Plumb Plan .....	69
To the Railroad Workers .....	71
Back On Again .....	72
A Disgrace .....	73
The Brotherhood Plan, or What? .....	74
General Articles .....	
Poland and the Jews .....	H. N. Brailsford 78
Night (Verse) .....	Elizabeth J. Coatsworth 81
Notes on French Politics .....	G. B. Noble 82
The Advertising Man .....	S. N. Behrman 84
The Cycle of Revolution .....	Alfred B. Kuttner 86
Some Day I Shall Be. (Verse.) .....	David Rosenthal 88
At Sunset. (Verse) .....	Evelyn Wells 88
Correspondence .....	89
After the Play .....	C. M. 94
Reviews of Books .....	
A Great Churchman .....	H. J. L. 95
Herbert Trench's Poems .....	L. R. 96
Emerson in French .....	Ellen Fitzgerald 98
Iron .....	S. N. B. 100

## The Week

ALL the correspondents in Paris report the anger of the Peace Conference at Rumania's action in marching on Budapest. That all of the great Powers are genuinely angry we very much doubt. But upon what grounds do any of them protest if Rumania uses her army to establish a basis for her territorial claims? Rumania did not invent that practice. French troops marched into the Saar a week after the signing of the armistice, and military occupation all along has been the best claim France has had to the Valley. British troops conquered Asia Minor—and have not yet withdrawn, despite the protests of the French. Italy rushed troops to the east shore of the Adriatic when the armistice was signed, and views possession as nine points of the case. Czech troops have marched into Hungary, and Polish troops into Galicia. Is Rumania to be denied because she is weaker than her peers? When the great Powers have set the example they need not protest if the smaller ones accept it.

THE case of Syria is one more instance to show that we are still far from that new international order which gives first place to self-determination. Neither England nor France seems primarily concerned with what the Syrians

think about Syria. France bases her claim on the Sykes-Picot treaty of 1916. But a year earlier there had been a treaty drawn between England, France and Russia for a settlement in Asia Minor. England's present claim seems to be that the collapse of Russian imperialism makes both agreements invalid. This point of law France cannot admit. But England has a better case than that. On her side is the one argument which more than any other wrote the territorial terms of the peace treaty. It was her troops that conquered Asia Minor.

BULGARIA had no reason to expect mercy at the hands of the Allies, and she will get no mercy. The small strip of Mediterranean seacoast which even her implacable Balkan enemies left her after her unconditional surrender in the second Balkan war is to be taken away, part going to the proposed free state of Constantinople, part to Greece. On strict principles of nationality Bulgaria's rights in this territory never were well grounded. In very few of the districts do the Bulgarians represent a majority, or even a plurality. But Bulgaria came into possession of this territory only through the recognition of her Balkan enemies that at least a show of compensation had to be made for the retention by Serbia of the indisputably Bulgarian districts of Macedonia and for the pillage of the Bulgarian Dobrudja by Rumania. The Paris statesmen know how to take away from Bulgaria what perhaps she should not have, but they do not know how to restore to her what is her right. As in most of their other territorial dispositions, the peace makers have worked toward the infliction of a greater injustice than existed heretofore, or would even now be inflicted by Bulgaria's ancient enemies if they could not act with imagined impunity under the sinister shadow of an imperialistic league.

MR. WILSON'S formal comment on Viscount Uchida's statement does not clear the issue in Shantung. For, while contesting one of Japan's claims, the President tacitly admits to full standing another which is of major importance. The point with which Mr. Wilson takes issue is Uchida's inference that the treaty of 1915 is valid. This agreement, by which Japan was further to despoil China, the President refuses to approve. He made that clear to the Japanese delegates in Paris. "Indeed," says Mr. Wilson, "I felt it my duty to say that nothing that I agreed to must be construed as an acquiescence on the part of the

government of the United States in the policy of the notes exchanged between China and Japan in 1915 and 1918, and reference was made in the discussion to the enforcement of the agreements of 1915 and 1918 only in case China failed to cooperate fully in carrying out the policy outlined in the statement of Baron Makino and Viscount Chinda."

UNDER the circumstances, since China must "cooperate fully" in a policy which is only defined in general terms, it will not be strange if Japan again comes forward with a claim that the 1915 and 1918 agreements are valid. But the point which Mr. Wilson entirely ignores is the statement, made in identical words both by Uchida and by his delegates in Paris, that Japan has no intention of surrendering any of the economic privileges in Shantung. Mr. Wilson must know that these privileges, enveloping completely the harbor of Tsingtao, the Kiao-Chau-Tsinanfu railway, and the coal and iron mines, amount to virtual possession of the province—no matter where the flimsy political authority resides. Nevertheless it seems that if the United States is to protest against the handing back of an empty shell to China the initiative must now come from the Senate.

DESPITE Mr. Wilson's use of the cost of living issue to push them along toward an indiscriminate ratification of the treaty, the Republican Senators are becoming bolder. In Tuesday's debate Mr. Lodge proposed that any reservations made by the Senate ought to be "accepted by at least the other four of the five principal allied and associated powers before we become members of the League." Mr. Lodge made this proposal informally; but in making it he stood on sound ground. If America makes reservations which are entirely "interpretive" the day may come when, acting on our own interpretation, we are nevertheless accused by our allies of bad faith. If reservations are worth making at all they are worth making definitely. Our associates will accept them. An American guarantee is something they will bid for, despite the fact that of late we have been offering it cheaply.

THAT part of his address to Congress in which Mr. Wilson discusses labor questions has thrown light on a much debated point. On the 20th of May the President spoke to Congress of the industrial organization of America: "We cannot go any farther in our present direction. . . . We must find another [road], leading in another direction and to a very different destination. It must lead not merely to accommodation but also to a genuine cooperation and partnership based upon a real community of interest and participation in control." To many, no doubt, it seemed possible that the President was returning home with a programme based upon his observation of democratic movements in Europe and one that might anticipate in some measure the industrial difficulties in store for America.

EXPECTATIONS of this sort are not encouraged by the address of last Friday. Mr. Wilson discussed the rela-

tions of capital and labor, but not in words that suggest the possession of a definite platform. His analysis of the situation could scarcely have been put in more general terms: "There are many things that ought to be corrected in the relations between capital and labor, in respect of wages and conditions of labor, and *other things* even more far reaching." Nor was his conclusion any less general. Employers and workmen must not continue as antagonists; "They must, on one plan or another, be effectively associated. Have we not steadiness and self-possession and business sense enough to work out that result? Undoubtedly we have, and we shall work it out."

A COMMON disapproval is about all that the New York newspapers share in their comment on the brotherhood plan for control of the railways. When they come to a political interpretation of the plan their unanimity goes to smash. The Times says "it is plainly a venture in radical socialism." But the Call, which is itself socialist, denies that there is any socialism in it and calls it "a sort of compromise syndicalism." The Evening Sun, less of an authority on socialism, agrees with the Call: "it is not even socialistic though it has a streak of socialism in it as an excuse or bait"—it is "essentially a class scheme of a peculiarly definite type." Meantime the World comes out flatly: "The plan of the railroad employees for taking over the railroad properties of the country is a straightout adventure into soviet economics."

ONE point in the testimony of Mr. Glenn E. Plumb before the House Committee on Interstate Commerce has had sensational comment. "Plumb Approves Bolshevik Theory of Public Ownership," says a startling headline in the New York World, and other journals in New York and out of it appear to have made a similar display. The incident which caused the stir was this: Representative Sanders of Indiana read from a document declaring the forests, mines and waterways to be public property, and asked Mr. Plumb if he agreed. Mr. Plumb said he did. Whereupon Mr. Sanders triumphantly remarked: "That is a direct quotation from a photographic copy of the Russian Soviet Government, as furnished by the State Department!" This sort of hide-and-seek, with its sensational publicity, is not a very creditable performance. The Soviet Constitution contains certain principles that Russia has adopted from the United States, and certain others that we should like to see the United States borrow from Russia. For instance, if Mr. Sanders will examine Part V, Chapter XVI, §80, he will find that Russia has a national budget. A little Bolshevism of that sort wouldn't harm our own progressive legislators.

THE Attorney-General faces a double task. He must not only bring criminal action against the packers for alleged violation of the anti-trust law; he must also create an emergency organization of Federal Attorneys and former State Administrators of the Food Administration to take the place of Mr. Hoover's abandoned machine. From neither of these two efforts need we expect early results. Time, and an organizer of Mr. Hoover's ability,

are needed to create a Food Administration. And criminal prosecution of the packers has produced so little in the past that scepticism is pardonable. The most encouraging aspect in the present agitation against the packers is the fact that it has set a Senate Committee at work on the Kenyon bill. This measure is more promising than prosecution, for the reason that it proposes a substitute for the system which it attacks.

AT the end of three days the Brooklyn Rapid Transit strike has ended in a victory for the employees. The single issue involved was recognition of the union. Mr. Garrison, receiver for the B.R.T., still balks at the word "recognition." But if the union can prove that it has enrolled more than fifty per cent of the B.R.T. employees, then Mr. Garrison will "entertain its grievances." With this phrase the employees are content, so long as they have the right to bargain collectively. For three days a great part of New York was put to inconvenience while Mr. Garrison talked of "outside organizers" and declared that the main issue was not between the B.R.T. and its employees, but between the police and "the disorderly element." Too often it is only after the public has paid the price that an employer consents to let his workmen address him through an organization of their own choosing.

LESS serious in its effects than the B.R.T. strike is the closing of half the summer plays on Broadway by the strike of the Actors' Equity Association. A good deal of fun has been poked at the striking actors. Nevertheless they have grievances, which are entirely legitimate. It was hard, for instance, to see why managers should profit from special performances and actors should not. The first demand of the actors, however—like the first demand of the B.R.T. conductors—is for recognition of their union. Because they are not so well organized as the conductors, their chances of success do not seem equally bright. When the steel unions tried to break into the plants at Gary and Homestead they found their weakness lay in the fact that they had never organized the unskilled work. So the actors are finding now, that in future they must build on the lowly chorus.

THE National Guard has always had its own political reasons for opposing a consolidation of military command in the federal government. It is therefore not possible to regard the most recent statement of the National Guard Association as entirely disinterested. Nevertheless the vigor with which the Association attacks Senator Chamberlain's bill for compulsory military training shows that in the ranks of the army men there is to be a real split. The Chamberlain bill, says the National Guard, is "nothing short of conscription under the guise of universal service"; "it creates at enormous expense the machinery for the establishment in America of that detestable Prussian system which is so abhorrent to the American people." It would not be surprising if Senator Chamberlain, Representative Kahn and Secretary Baker found active support for their new plans coming almost exclusively from the ever-ready Defense Societies.

## Direct Action and the Plumb Plan

IN response to questions put to them from all sides the organized railroad employees announced on August 9th that "we have no desire, and have had none, to impress upon the public by violence, or by threat, our proposal that the railroads be nationalized under tripartite control." As Mr. Plumb said in his testimony, "this is a question of statesmanship." Does this mean that the public is justified in putting out of mind the thought of a railroad strike? Not at all. Side by side with the constructive proposal of the brotherhoods is the demand for an immediate increase of real wages, this to be accomplished either by reduction of prices or an advance in money wages. The demand is backed frankly by the threat of a strike. But behind both the plan and the demand is something greater than the assurances of any leader. It is the restlessness of the rank and file and in that restlessness is to be found the cause of the sudden and unexpected turn in railroad affairs. The men have forced the pace. They have pushed the leaders further and more quickly than they had planned to go at the present time, and they have made the Plumb plan, destined until a few days ago to be advocated slowly by education, into the central issue of the day. And so, while there is no doubt of the sincerity and essential conservatism of the brotherhood leaders in their promise not to use direct action, it will be the rank and file who will determine the speed with which they move. Unless prices should go down, as no one expects them to, railroad disorders are inevitable as they now stand, and once the men are in a mood to strike no one can tell whether their demands will be confined to wages or whether they will embrace the Plumb plan as well.

In other words, the facts, not the intentions or the theories of the leaders, indicate a very strong tendency toward direct action, and every move by the press and by public officials to weaken the authority of the leaders increases the probability of it. Let us get this into our heads at the outset. The leaders of the brotherhoods are not revolutionists, not socialists. They represent as conservative a leadership as any one now living can hope to find in the labor movement. They are moderate, more averse to violence, more convinced of the desirability of reasoned solutions than the men whom they represent. They have every personal interest in avoiding the terrors of a great transportation strike. To each one of them as individuals a strike would mean personal dangers of an extraordinary kind, and they know more clearly than any one else just what these would be.

Copyright of New Republic is the property of New Republic and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.